

Remarks

Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections expressed in the Office Action of July 12, 2006 are respectfully contended in view of the following remarks and the application as amended. The present invention relates generally to a polymer-coated paper ream wrapper that is coated or covered with varnish or other coating material in specific zones, so as to prevent heat-sealing of the ream wrapper to the packaged paper inside the wrapper.

The title of the invention has been clarified by this Amendment and Response. Also, claims 1-8, 10-12 and 14 have been cancelled, claims 9 and 13 amended (as described below), and claims 15-19 added, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention.

Claim 9 was objected to because of informalities. This claim has been clarified as advised by the Examiner. Also, claim 9 was clarified to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection noted in the Office Action.

Claims 9 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Knauf (U.S. 2004/0157025). The Office Action states, inter alia, that Knauf teaches a method of making a polymer-coated paper ream wrapper, wherein a polyethylene layer is used to create a seal with the application of heat (emphasis in Office Action).

Knauf relates to a wrapper for a ream of paper having an inner surface coated with polyethylene. When the wrapper is formed about a ream of paper, the inner layer overlaps and contacts the outer layer along a longitudinal seam. The polyethylene layer is used to create a seal with the application of heat.

Applicants respectfully contend that the claims as amended overcome this rejection. Specifically, the subjecting of a ream wrapper to curing apart from heating, as presently claimed, is contrary to a heat seal application. Support for this distinction is found at page 2, paragraph 3 of Applicants' specification: "*During the wrapping process, the wrapper is subjected to heat or other curing methods...*" (emphasis added). Indeed, there exist alternative ways of adhering or

hardening a polymer material (i.e., curing) other than by heat, e.g., curing by chemical additives, ultraviolet radiation or electron beam. Furthermore, by describing only heat sealing in its disclosure, Knauf provides no teaching, suggestion or motivation to employ the curing aspect as presently claimed, and this rejection is overcome.

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully contended that the solicited claims define patentable subject matter. Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections expressed in the Office Action of July 12, 2006 are respectfully submitted. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if any questions arise during the course of reconsideration of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/10/07

Richard A. Paikoff

Richard A. Paikoff  
Reg. No. 34,892  
Duane Morris LLP  
30 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196  
tel. 215-979-1853

DM2920926.1